1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7		i
8	CHRISTOPHER ANDREW BISTRYSKI,	CASE NO. 3:17-cv-5369 RJB-TLF
9	Plaintiff,	
10	v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR COUNSEL
11	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,	
12	Defendants.	
13	Before the Court is Plaintiff Christopher Bistryski's motion for the appointment of	
14	counsel. Dkt. 7. Mr. Bistryski states that he requires appointment of counsel as he has been	
15	unable to obtain counsel on his own and he is indigent. <i>Id</i> .	
16	DISCUSSION	
17	There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
18	Although the court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), can request counsel to represent a party	
19	proceeding <i>in forma pauperis</i> , the court may do so only in exceptional circumstances. <i>Wilborn v</i> .	
20	Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th	
21	Cir. 1984); <i>Aldabe v. Aldabe</i> , 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional	
22	circumstances requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the	
23	ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims <i>pro se</i> in light of the complexity of the legal issues	
24	define of the planting to articulate his claims pro s	a magne of the complexity of the legal issues

involved. Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331. Neither of these factors is dispositive and both must be 2 viewed together before reaching a decision on request of counsel under Section 1915(d). Id. 3 Plaintiff has demonstrated an adequate ability to articulate his claims pro se but has not demonstrated that the issues involved in this case are complex. Plaintiff's incarceration and 5 limited legal training are not exceptional factors constituting exceptional circumstances that warrant the appointment of counsel. Rather, they are the type of difficulties encountered by many 6 pro se litigants. Plaintiff has also not shown a likelihood of success on the merits. See, e.g., 7 Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331. 8 9 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**: Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel (Dkt. 7) is **DENIED.** 10 (1) 11 The Clerk of Court is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff and to (2) 12 counsel for defendants. 13 Dated this 30th day of August, 2017. 14 Theresa L. Frike 15 16 United States Magistrate Judge 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24